

# Pseudoscalar glueball mass from $\eta$ - $\eta'$ - $G$ mixing

Hai-Yang Cheng<sup>1,\*</sup>, Hsiang-nan Li<sup>1,2,3,†</sup> and Keh-Fei Liu<sup>4,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan 115, Republic of China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Tsing-Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan 300, Republic of China*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, National Cheng-Kung University,*

*Tainan, Taiwan 701, Republic of China and*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506*

We deduce the mass of the pseudoscalar glueball  $G$  from an  $\eta$ - $\eta'$ - $G$  mixing formalism based on the anomalous Ward identity for transition matrix elements. With the inputs from the recent KLOE experiment, we find a solution for the pseudoscalar glueball mass around  $(1.4 \pm 0.1)$  GeV, which is fairly insensitive to a range of inputs with or without Okubo-Zweig-Iizuka-rule violating effects. This affirms that  $\eta(1405)$ , having a large production rate in the radiative  $J/\Psi$  decay and not seen in  $\gamma\gamma$  reactions, is indeed a leading candidate for the pseudoscalar glueball. Other relevant quantities including the anomaly and pseudoscalar density matrix elements are obtained. The decay widths for  $G \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, \ell^+\ell^-$  are also predicted.

PACS numbers: 14.40.Cs, 12.40.Yx

## I. INTRODUCTION

The quest for pseudoscalar glueballs has continued for decades. An  $E(1420)$  meson with a mass of 1426 MeV was first discovered at CERN in 1963 through  $p\bar{p}$  interactions [1]. In 1980, Mark II observed that a  $J/\psi$  meson decays via photon emission into a resonance at a mass around 1440 MeV [2]. This new state, named  $\iota(1440)$  by Mark II and Crystal Ball Collaborations [3], was also once called  $G(1440)$  in [4, 5]. Shortly after the Mark II experiment,  $E(1420)$  and  $\iota(1440)$  were first proposed to be the pseudoscalar glueball candidates in [6] and in [4, 5, 7], respectively, while an opposite opinion that  $E(1420)$  was an  $1^+ s\bar{s}$  quark state was advocated in [8]. As the experimental situation was sorted out,  $E(1420)$  turned out to be an  $1^+$  meson now known as  $f_1(1420)$ , and  $\iota(1440)$  was a pseudoscalar state now known as  $\eta(1405)$ . For an excellent review of the  $E$  and  $\iota$  mesons, see [9].

$\eta(1405)$  indeed behaves like a glueball in its productions and decays. The  $K\bar{K}\pi$  and  $\eta\pi\pi$  channels in  $\gamma\gamma$  collisions have been investigated [10]. While  $\eta(1475)$  in  $K\bar{K}\pi$  was observed,  $\eta(1405)$  in  $\eta\pi\pi$  was not. Since the glueball production is presumably suppressed in  $\gamma\gamma$  collisions, the above observations suggest that the latter state has a large glueball content [11].  $J/\psi$  radiative decays through  $\gamma gg$  have been considered as the ideal channels of searching for glueballs. The branching ratio  $\mathcal{B}(J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta(1405))$  of order  $10^{-3}$  is much larger than the decays  $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta(1295), \gamma\eta(2225), \dots$  which are either not seen or are of order  $10^{-4}$ . The decay of a nearby  $\eta(1475) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  has been observed [10], but  $\eta(1405) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  has not. All these features support the proposal that  $\eta(1405)$  is a good pseudoscalar glueball candidate [9]. There were also theoretical support based on the closed flux-tube model [12] and the model that combines the octet, the singlet, and the glueball into a decuplet [13]. Besides  $\eta(1405)$ , other states with masses below 2 GeV have also been proposed as the candidates, such as  $\eta(1760)$  in [14] and  $X(1835)$  in [15].

As for the scalar glueball, two of the authors (HYC and KFL) and Chua [16] have considered a model for the glueball and  $q\bar{q}$  mixing, which involves the neutral scalar mesons  $f_0(1370)$ ,  $f_0(1500)$  and  $f_0(1710)$ , based on two lattice results: (i) a much better SU(3) symmetry in the scalar sector than in the other meson sectors [17] and (ii) an unmixed scalar glueball at about 1.7 GeV in the quenched approximation [18]. It was found that  $f_0(1500)$  is a fairly pure octet, having very little mixing with the singlet and the glueball, while  $f_0(1370)$  and  $f_0(1710)$  are dominated by the glueball and the  $q\bar{q}$  singlet, respectively, with about 10% mixing between them.

---

\*Electronic address: phcheng@phys.sinica.edu.tw

†Electronic address: hnli@phys.sinica.edu.tw

‡Electronic address: liu@pa.uky.edu

The observed enhancement of  $\omega f_0(1710)$  production over  $\phi f_0(1710)$  in hadronic  $J/\psi$  decays and the copious  $f_0(1710)$  production in radiative  $J/\psi$  decays lend further support to the prominent glueball nature of  $f_0(1710)$ .

Contrary to the above case, the pseudoscalar glueball interpretation for  $\eta(1405)$  is, however, not favored by quenched lattice gauge calculations, which predicted the mass of the  $0^{-+}$  state to be above 2 GeV in [19] and around 2.6 GeV in [18, 20]. It is not favored by the sum-rule analysis with predictions higher than 1.8 GeV [21, 22] either. Readers are referred to [23] for a recent review on the results of the glueball masses. Note that the above lattice calculations were performed under the quenched approximation without the fermion determinants. It is believed that dynamical fermions may have a significant effect in the pseudoscalar channel, because they raise the singlet would-be-Goldstone boson mass from that of the pion to  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$ . It has been argued that the pseudoscalar glueball mass in full QCD is substantially lower than that in the quenched approximation [22]. In view of the fact that the topological susceptibility is large ( $\approx (191\text{MeV})^4$ ) in the quenched approximation [24], and yet is zero for full QCD in the chiral limit, it is conceivable that full QCD has a large effect on the glueball as it does on  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$ .

In this paper, we infer the pseudoscalar glueball mass  $m_G$  from the  $\eta$ - $\eta'$ - $G$  mixing, where  $G$  denotes the physical pseudoscalar glueball. Implementing this mixing into the equations of motion for the anomalous Ward identity, that connects the vacuum to  $\eta$ ,  $\eta'$  and  $G$  transition matrix elements of the divergence of axial-vector currents to those of pseudoscalar densities and the U(1) anomaly,  $m_G$  is related to other phenomenological quantities such as the  $\eta$ ,  $\eta'$  masses, the decay constants, and the mixing angles. Since the mixing angles have been measured recently from the  $\phi \rightarrow \gamma\eta, \gamma\eta'$  decays by KLOE [25],  $m_G$  can be solved. Our numerical study gives a fairly robust result  $m_G \approx 1.4$  GeV, which is insensitive to a range of inputs. We also obtain the matrix elements for the pseudoscalar densities and axial U(1) anomaly associated with the  $\eta$ ,  $\eta'$ , and  $G$  states. The values of the pseudoscalar density matrix elements for the  $\eta$ ,  $\eta'$  mesons are close to those obtained in the Feldmann-Kroll-Stech (FKS) scheme [26], which does not include the mixing with the pseudoscalar glueball. The results of the anomaly matrix elements for the above states are quite consistent with those estimated from the topological susceptibility [27, 28, 29] and the lattice evaluation [18], indicating that the  $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta'$  branching ratio could be comparable to that of  $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma G$ . We then study the pseudoscalar glueball decays into two photons and two leptons  $G \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, \ell^+\ell^-$ . The comparison of our analysis with the properties of known mesons suggests that the  $\eta(1405)$  meson is a strong pseudoscalar glueball candidate.

In sec. II we set up the formalism for the  $\eta$ - $\eta'$ - $G$  mixing, assuming that the glueball only mixes with the flavor-singlet  $\eta_1$ , but not with the flavor-octet  $\eta_8$ . Our parametrization for the mixing matrix contains only two angles and differs from that in [25], where it is assumed that  $\eta$  does not mix with the glueball state. The solution for the pseudoscalar gluaball mass  $m_G$  is derived in Sec. III with the phenomenological inputs from KLOE [25]. The solutions with the inputs from [30] and from [26] as a limit of vanishing mixture with the glueball state are also presented for comparison. It will be shown in Sec. IV that the result for  $m_G$  is stable against the variations of phenomenological inputs and of corrections violating the Okubo-Zweig-Iizuka (OZI) rule [31]. The  $G \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, \ell^+\ell^-$  decay widths are also estimated. Section V is the conclusion.

## II. $\eta$ - $\eta'$ - $G$ MIXING

We extend the FKS formalism [26] for the  $\eta$ - $\eta'$  mixing to include the pseudoscalar glueball  $G$ . In the FKS scheme, the conventional singlet-octet basis and the quark-flavor basis have been proposed. For the latter, the  $q\bar{q} \equiv (u\bar{u} + d\bar{d})/\sqrt{2}$  and  $s\bar{s}$  flavor states, labeled by the  $\eta_q$  and  $\eta_s$  mesons, respectively, are defined. In the extension to the  $\eta$ - $\eta'$ - $G$  mixing, the physical states  $\eta$ ,  $\eta'$  and  $G$  are related to the octet, singlet, and unmixed glueball states  $\eta_8$ ,  $\eta_1$  and  $g$ , respectively, through the combination of rotations

$$\begin{pmatrix} |\eta\rangle \\ |\eta'\rangle \\ |G\rangle \end{pmatrix} = U_3(\theta)U_1(\phi_G) \begin{pmatrix} |\eta_8\rangle \\ |\eta_1\rangle \\ |g\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

with the matrices

$$U_3(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta & 0 \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_1(\phi_G) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos\phi_G & \sin\phi_G \\ 0 & -\sin\phi_G & \cos\phi_G \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

The matrix  $U_1$  ( $U_3$ ) represents a rotation around the axis along the  $\eta_8$  meson (unmixed glueball  $g$ ). Equation (1) is based on the assumption that  $\eta_8$  does not mix with the glueball, under which two mixing angles  $\theta$  and  $\phi_G$  are sufficient.

The octet and singlet states are related to the flavor states via

$$\begin{pmatrix} |\eta_8\rangle \\ |\eta_1\rangle \\ |g\rangle \end{pmatrix} = U_3(\theta_i) \begin{pmatrix} |\eta_q\rangle \\ |\eta_s\rangle \\ |g\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\theta_i$  is the ideal mixing angle with  $\cos \theta_i = \sqrt{1/3}$  and  $\sin \theta_i = \sqrt{2/3}$ , i.e.,  $\theta_i = 54.7^\circ$ . The flavor states are then transformed into the physical states through the mixing matrix

$$\begin{aligned} U(\phi, \phi_G) &= U_3(\theta)U_1(\phi_G)U_3(\theta_i), \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi + \sin \theta \sin \theta_i \Delta_G & -\sin \phi + \sin \theta \cos \theta_i \Delta_G & -\sin \theta \sin \phi_G \\ \sin \phi - \cos \theta \sin \theta_i \Delta_G & \cos \phi - \cos \theta \cos \theta_i \Delta_G & \cos \theta \sin \phi_G \\ -\sin \theta_i \sin \phi_G & -\cos \theta_i \sin \phi_G & \cos \phi_G \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with the angle  $\phi = \theta + \theta_i$  and the abbreviation  $\Delta_G = 1 - \cos \phi_G$ .  $U$  has been written in the form, which approaches the FKS mixing matrix [26] in the  $\phi_G \rightarrow 0$  limit. That is, the angle  $\phi$  plays the same role as the mixing angle in the FKS scheme.

Our formalism assumes isospin symmetry, i.e. no mixing with  $\pi^0$ , and neglects other possible admixtures from  $c\bar{c}$  states and radial excitations. The widely studied decay constants  $f_q$  and  $f_s$  are defined by [26]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0 | \bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 q | \eta_q(P) \rangle &= -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} f_q P^\mu, \\ \langle 0 | \bar{s} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 s | \eta_s(P) \rangle &= -i f_s P^\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for the light quark  $q = u$  or  $d$ . The  $\eta_q$  ( $\eta_s$ ) meson decay constant  $f_q^s$  ( $f_s^q$ ) through the  $s$  ( $q$ ) quark current [32], and the unmixed glueball decay constants  $f_g^{q,s}$  through the  $q$  and  $s$  quark currents, can be defined in a similar way:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0 | \bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 q | \eta_s(P), g(P) \rangle &= -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} f_{s,g}^q P^\mu, \\ \langle 0 | \bar{s} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 s | \eta_q(P), g(P) \rangle &= -i f_{q,g}^s P^\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The decay constants associated with the  $\eta$  meson,  $\eta'$  meson, and the physical glueball defined in

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0 | \bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 q | \eta(P), \eta'(P), G(P) \rangle &= -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} f_{\eta,\eta',G}^q P^\mu, \\ \langle 0 | \bar{s} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 s | \eta(P), \eta'(P), G(P) \rangle &= -i f_{\eta,\eta',G}^s P^\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

are related to those associated with the  $\eta_q$ ,  $\eta_s$ , and  $g$  states via the same mixing matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_\eta^q & f_\eta^s \\ f_{\eta'}^q & f_{\eta'}^s \\ f_G^q & f_G^s \end{pmatrix} = U(\phi, \phi_G) \begin{pmatrix} f_q^q & f_q^s \\ f_s^q & f_s^s \\ f_g^q & f_g^s \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Sandwiching the equations of motion for the anomalous Ward identity

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu (\bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 q) &= 2im_q \bar{q} \gamma_5 q + \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}, \\ \partial_\mu (\bar{s} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 s) &= 2im_s \bar{s} \gamma_5 s + \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

between vacuum and  $|\eta\rangle$ ,  $|\eta'\rangle$  and  $|G\rangle$ , where  $G_{\mu\nu}$  is the field-strength tensor and  $\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$  the dual field-strength tensor, and following the procedure in [32], we derive

$$M_{qsg}^2 = U^\dagger(\phi, \phi_G) M^2 U(\phi, \phi_G) \tilde{J}. \quad (10)$$

In the above expression the matrices are written as

$$M_{qsg}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_{qq}^2 + (\sqrt{2}/f_q)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle & m_{sq}^2 + (1/f_s)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle & 0 \\ m_{qs}^2 + (\sqrt{2}/f_q)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle & m_{ss}^2 + (1/f_s)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle & 0 \\ m_{gg}^2 + (\sqrt{2}/f_q)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle & m_{sg}^2 + (1/f_s)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_\eta^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_{\eta'}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_G^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & f_q^s/f_s & 0 \\ f_s^q/f_q & 1 & 0 \\ f_g^q/f_q & f_g^s/f_s & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

with the abbreviation

$$m_{qq,qs,qq}^2 \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2}}{f_q}\langle 0|m_u\bar{u}i\gamma_5u + m_d\bar{d}i\gamma_5d|\eta_q, \eta_s, g\rangle,$$

$$m_{sq,ss,sg}^2 \equiv \frac{2}{f_s}\langle 0|m_s\bar{s}i\gamma_5s|\eta_q, \eta_s, g\rangle. \quad (12)$$

In the limit of the large color number  $N_c$ , the scaling for the decay constants, the pseudoscalar densities, and the anomaly matrix elements is [33]

$$\begin{aligned} f_{q,s} &\sim O(\sqrt{N_c}), & f_g^{q,s} &\sim O(1), & f_q^s &\sim f_s^q \sim O(1/\sqrt{N_c}), \\ m_G &\sim O(1), & \phi_G &\sim O(1/\sqrt{N_c}), \\ m_{qq}^2 &\sim O(1), & m_{ss}^2 &\sim O(1), \\ m_{qg}^2 &\sim m_{sg}^2 \sim O(1/\sqrt{N_c}), & m_{qs}^2 &\sim m_{sq}^2 \sim O(1/N_c), \\ \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle &\sim O(1), & \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle &\sim \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle \sim O(1/\sqrt{N_c}). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The pseudoscalar meson and glueball masses scale as  $O(1)$  in large  $N_c$ . However, it has been pointed out [27, 28, 29] that the sub-leading  $O(1/N_c)$  term in the  $\eta_1$  mass squared  $m_{\eta_1}^2 \sim O(1) + O(1/N_c)$  is numerically large due to the  $U(1)$  anomaly, and is related to the topological susceptibility  $\chi$  in the quenched QCD without fermions. In the chiral limit, the relation  $m_{\eta'}^2 = 4N_F\chi/f_\pi^2 = 2\sqrt{N_F}\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta'\rangle/f_\pi$  with  $N_F$  being the number of flavors gives  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta'\rangle \approx 0.035 \text{ GeV}^3$  for  $\chi = (191 \text{ MeV})^4$  [24]. Although being  $O(1/\sqrt{N_c})$  in large  $N_c$ , this anomaly matrix element is numerically much larger than the  $O(\sqrt{N_c})$  quantities  $m_{qq}^2 f_q \approx 0.0026 \text{ GeV}^3$  for  $m_{qq}^2 \approx m_\pi^2$  and comparable to  $m_{ss}^2 f_s \approx 0.087 \text{ GeV}^3$  for  $m_{ss}^2 \approx 2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$ . In view of this, we shall keep all the anomaly matrix elements for  $\eta_q, \eta_s$  and  $g$  in the following analysis. On the other hand, we expect the decay constants and the pseudoscalar density matrix elements to have the normal ordering in terms of  $N_c$ . That is, we expect  $f_{q,s} > f_g^{q,s} > f_q^s, f_s^q, m_{qq}^2 > m_{qg}^2 > m_{qs}^2$ , and  $m_{ss}^2 > m_{sg}^2 > m_{sq}^2$ . The above ordering is consistent with the OZI rule in that double quark annihilation, which is present in  $f_q^s, f_s^q, m_{qs}^2$  and  $m_{sq}^2$  but not in others, is OZI-rule violating and suppressed. We note that the two sides of each of the equations in Eq. (10) have the same  $N_c$  scaling, implying consistency of our formalism in terms of  $N_c$ .

### III. PSEUDOSCALAR GLUEBALL MASS

The explicit expansion of Eq. (10) leads to

$$U_{11}^\dagger[U_{11} + U_{12}R' + U_{13}r']m_\eta^2 + U_{12}^\dagger[U_{21} + U_{22}R' + U_{23}r']m_{\eta'}^2 + U_{13}^\dagger[U_{31} + U_{32}R' + U_{33}r']m_G^2 \\ = m_{qq}^2 + (\sqrt{2}/f_q)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle, \quad (14)$$

$$U_{11}^\dagger[U_{11}R + U_{12} + U_{13}r]m_\eta^2 + U_{12}^\dagger[U_{21}R + U_{22} + U_{23}r]m_{\eta'}^2 + U_{13}^\dagger[U_{31}R + U_{32} + U_{33}r]m_G^2 \\ = m_{sq}^2 + (1/f_s)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle, \quad (15)$$

$$= m_{qs}^2 + (\sqrt{2}/f_q)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle, \quad (16)$$

$$U_{21}^\dagger[U_{11}R + U_{12} + U_{13}r]m_\eta^2 + U_{22}^\dagger[U_{21}R + U_{22} + U_{23}r]m_{\eta'}^2 + U_{23}^\dagger[U_{31}R + U_{32} + U_{33}r]m_G^2 \\ = m_{ss}^2 + (1/f_s)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle, \quad (17)$$

$$U_{31}^\dagger[U_{11} + U_{12}R' + U_{13}r']m_\eta^2 + U_{32}^\dagger[U_{21} + U_{22}R' + U_{23}r']m_{\eta'}^2 + U_{33}^\dagger[U_{31} + U_{32}R' + U_{33}r']m_G^2 \\ = m_{qg}^2 + (\sqrt{2}/f_q)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle, \quad (18)$$

$$U_{31}^\dagger[U_{11}R + U_{12} + U_{13}r]m_\eta^2 + U_{32}^\dagger[U_{21}R + U_{22} + U_{23}r]m_{\eta'}^2 + U_{33}^\dagger[U_{31}R + U_{32} + U_{33}r]m_G^2 \\ = m_{sg}^2 + (1/f_s)\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where the parameters  $r \equiv f_g^s/f_s$ ,  $r' \equiv f_g^q/f_q$ ,  $R \equiv f_s^s/f_s$ , and  $R' \equiv f_s^q/f_q$  are introduced, and  $U_{ij}$  denotes the matrix element of  $U$ . In developing our mixing formalism, the flavor-independent couplings between the glueball  $g$  and the pseudoscalar  $u\bar{u}$ ,  $d\bar{d}$  and  $s\bar{s}$  states are assumed, so that  $g$  only mixes with the flavor-singlet  $\eta_1$ . Accordingly, we postulate  $f_g^q = \sqrt{2}f_g^s$  and  $f_s^q = f_s^s$ , and thus the relations

$$r' = \sqrt{2}\frac{f_s}{f_q}r \quad R' = \frac{f_s}{f_q}R, \quad (20)$$

which will be adopted in the numerical study in Sec. IV.

We first explore the implication of the  $\eta$ - $\eta'$ - $G$  mixing on the glueball mass  $m_G$ . To simplify the matter, the ratios  $r$ ,  $r'$ ,  $R$  and  $R'$  are neglected, which are  $O(1/\sqrt{N_c})$  and  $O(1/N_c)$ , respectively, in large  $N_c$  as shown in Eq. (13). We also neglect  $m_{qg}^2$  and  $m_{sg}^2$  relative to the numerically large anomaly term  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle/f_{q,s}$  as an approximation. It should be safe to drop  $m_{qg}^2$ , since it is, like the small  $m_{qq}^2 \approx m_\pi^2$ , proportional to the light  $u/d$  quark mass. On the other hand, it is not clear if it is safe to drop  $m_{sg}^2$ . Although it is  $O(1/\sqrt{N_c})$  compared to  $m_{ss}^2$ , but the latter, being proportional to the strange quark mass, is larger than  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta'\rangle/f_s$  in the chiral limit as discussed in Sec. II. This subject will be investigated in a more detailed numerical analysis later in Sec. IV. Having made the above assumptions, we take the ratio of Eqs. (18) and (19), and obtain

$$\frac{c\theta(s\phi - c\theta s\theta_i\Delta_G)m_{\eta'}^2 - s\theta(c\phi + s\theta s\theta_i\Delta_G)^2m_\eta^2 - s\theta_i c\phi_G m_G^2}{c\theta(c\phi - c\theta c\theta_i\Delta_G)m_{\eta'}^2 + s\theta(s\phi - s\theta c\theta_i\Delta_G)^2m_\eta^2 - c\theta_i c\phi_G m_G^2} = \frac{\sqrt{2}f_s}{f_q}, \quad (21)$$

where  $c\phi$  ( $s\phi$ ) is the shorthand notation for  $\cos\phi$  ( $\sin\phi$ ) and similarly for others.

Note that the above simple formula still holds, even after keeping the  $r'$ - and  $r$ -dependent terms, as long as they obey Eq. (20). In other words, the  $r'$ -dependent terms in Eq. (18) and the  $r$ -dependent terms in Eq. (19) can be absorbed into the right-hand sides of these equations and are therefore canceled after taking the ratio of Eqs. (18) and (19). The factor  $\sin\phi_G$  in the numerator and the denominator of Eq. (21) has been canceled out, so that the  $\phi_G$  dependence appears at order of  $\Delta_G \approx \phi_G^2$  for small  $\phi_G$ . As such, we find that the solution for  $m_G$  is stable against the most uncertain input  $\phi_G$ , as long as the  $\eta, \eta'$  mesons do not mix with the glueball  $g$  intensively. The solution depends on the ratio  $f_s/f_q$ , which is, through Eqs. (15) and (16), related to

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}f_s}{f_q} = \frac{\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle}{\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle}, \quad (22)$$

if the pseudoscalar density matrix elements  $m_{qs}^2$  and  $m_{sq}^2$  are neglected. It implies that the SU(3) symmetry breaking in the axial anomaly matrix element echoes the symmetry breaking in the decay constants, and plays

a sensitive role in the determination of the pseudoscalar glueball mass. For a given  $\phi_G$ ,  $m_G$  increases with decreasing  $f_s/f_q$ . By the same token, when the anomaly matrix element for the  $\eta_s$  becomes larger relative to that of the  $\eta_q$  meson, the mass of the pseudoscalar glueball gets higher.

Before solving for  $m_G$  from Eq. (21), we explain the strategies for data fitting adopted in [25] and [30], which led to different extractions of the mixing angle  $\phi_G$ . In Ref. [25], the decay constants  $f_q = (1 \pm 0.01)f_\pi$  and  $f_s = (1.4 \pm 0.014)f_\pi$  [34], and the parameters associated with meson wave function overlaps [35] were fixed as inputs. The angles  $\phi = (39.7 \pm 0.7)^\circ$  and  $\phi_G = (22 \pm 3)^\circ$  were then determined from the relevant data. A tiny error (1%) was assigned to  $f_q$  and  $f_s$ , which is one of the reasons why a high precision was reached for the determination of  $\phi_G$ . In [30] the data of  $P \rightarrow \gamma V$  and  $V \rightarrow \gamma P$  were first considered, which do not depend on  $f_q$  and  $f_s$ , and the fit gave the outcomes  $\phi = (41.4 \pm 1.3)^\circ$  and  $\phi_G = (12 \pm 13)^\circ$ . Without precise inputs of  $f_q$  and  $f_s$ , and with the hadronic parameters for meson wave function overlaps being free, it is not unexpected to get a wide range for  $\phi_G$ . The value of  $\phi_G$ , being consistent with zero [36], means that the data could be accommodated by the hadronic uncertainty alone. The extracted  $\phi$  and  $\phi_G$  were then used as inputs to determine  $f_q$  and  $f_s$  from the  $\eta, \eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  data. Since  $\phi_G$  has a wide range, the results  $f_q = (1.05 \pm 0.03)f_\pi$  and  $f_s = (1.57 \pm 0.28)f_\pi$  also have larger errors. The correlation between  $\phi_G$  and  $f_s$  (a smaller  $\phi_G$  corresponding to a larger  $f_s$ ) is a consequence of the constraint from these data. We also note that a larger mixing angle  $\phi_G = (33 \pm 13)^\circ$  has been extracted from the  $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$  data recently [37]. In summary, both sets of parameters in [25, 30] can fit the data, and are consistent with each other within their uncertainties. It is seen that  $f_q$ ,  $f_s$ , and  $\phi$  are more or less certain, but  $\phi_G$  varies in a wider range. Fortunately, the solution for the pseudoscalar glueball mass  $m_G$  is not sensitive to  $\phi_G$  as discussed above and will be explored further in the remainder of this paper.

As stated before, KLOE postulated that the glueball does not mix with  $\eta$  [25]. We shall point out that this postulate does not yield a solution for  $m_G$  in our formalism. The KLOE parametrization for the  $\eta$ - $\eta'$ - $G$  mixing matrix is written as

$$U_{\text{KLOE}} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi & -\sin \phi & 0 \\ \sin \phi \cos \phi_G & \cos \phi \cos \phi_G & \sin \phi_G \\ -\sin \phi \sin \phi_G & -\cos \phi \sin \phi_G & \cos \phi_G \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Repeating the above procedure, Eq. (21) is modified to

$$\frac{s\phi c\phi_G s\phi_G(m_{\eta'}^2 - m_G^2)}{c\phi c\phi_G s\phi_G(m_{\eta'}^2 - m_G^2)} = \frac{s\phi}{c\phi} = \frac{\sqrt{2}f_s}{f_q}. \quad (24)$$

For the KLOE parameter set  $f_q = f_\pi$ ,  $f_s = 1.4f_\pi$  and  $\phi = 39.7^\circ$  [25], Eq. (24) does not hold, and there is no solution for  $m_G$  as a result.

Since we have changed the mixing matrix from KLOE's in Eq. (23) to Eq. (4), we need to refit  $\phi$  and  $\phi_G$  in principle. However, comparing Eqs. (23) and (4), it is easy to find that their  $2 \times 2$  sub-matrices in the left-upper hand corner have almost equal elements for  $\phi \approx 40^\circ$  and  $\phi_G \approx 22^\circ$ :

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 0.751 & -0.654 & 0.097 \\ 0.585 & 0.725 & 0.362 \\ -0.306 & -0.216 & 0.927 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_{\text{KLOE}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.766 & -0.643 & 0 \\ 0.596 & 0.710 & 0.375 \\ -0.241 & -0.287 & 0.927 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

These four elements, which are responsible for the quark mixing, are the only ones involved in the data fitting of  $\phi \rightarrow \gamma\eta, \gamma\eta'$ ,  $\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\rho, \gamma\omega$ , and  $\eta, \eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  mentioned above. Therefore, it is expected that the refit of the data using our parametrization will give the mixing angles close to KLOE's. That is, the KLOE parameter set can be employed directly in our numerical analysis within uncertainty. The other off-diagonal elements in Eq. (25), describing the mixing among the  $\eta, \eta'$  mesons and the glueball, do have different values. It is thus understood why the two parametrizations have similar mixing angles, but the ratios in Eqs. (21) and (24) exhibit different behaviors as far as  $m_G$  is concerned.

It is also interesting to consider the parameter set from [26] with  $f_q = (1.07 \pm 0.02)f_\pi$ ,  $f_s = (1.34 \pm 0.06)f_\pi$ ,  $\phi = (39.3 \pm 1.0)^\circ$ , and  $\phi_G = 0$  (no mixing with the pseudoscalar glueball). Note that the lower  $f_s$  in [26] arises from combined experimental and phenomenological constraints. If only the experimental constraints were used, mainly those of the  $\eta, \eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  data, its central value would increase and the range is enlarged, giving  $f_s = (1.42 \pm 0.16)f_\pi$  close to that extracted in [25]. Using the central values of  $f_s/f_q$  and  $\phi_G$  from [25, 26, 30] as inputs, we derive the pseudoscalar glueball mass from Eq. (21) [see also Eqs. (27)-(29) below]

$$m_G = 1.41, \quad 1.56, \quad 1.30 \text{ GeV}, \quad (26)$$

respectively. The above investigation leads to  $m_G = (1.4 \pm 0.1)$  GeV with the currently determined phenomenological parameters. The proximity of the predicted  $m_G$  to the mass of  $\eta(1405)$  and other properties of  $\eta(1405)$  make it a very strong candidate for the pseudoscalar glueball. We shall come back to visit the robustness of our prediction in the next section, when higher order effects in  $1/N_c$  are included.

One may question whether other pseudoscalar mesons with masses around 1.4 GeV, such as  $\eta(1295)$  and  $\eta(1475)$ , should be included into our mixing formalism. We note that  $\eta(1295)$  and  $\eta(1475)$  have been assigned as the  $2^1S_0$  states, namely, the radial excitations of  $q\bar{q}$  and  $s\bar{s}$ , respectively [38, 39]. As stated in the previous section, these radial excitations do not mix with the  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$  mesons by definition, since they are diagonalized under the same Hamiltonian. As for the mixing of the radial excitations with the glueball, we speculate that it is negligible for the following reason.  $\eta(1295)$  is practically degenerate with the radially excited pion  $\pi(1300)$ , and  $\eta(1475)$  is about 200 MeV above  $\eta(1295)$ , a situation similar to the ideal mixing in the vector meson sector with  $\phi(1020)$  being  $\sim 200$  MeV above  $\omega(780)$ . This suggests that  $\eta(1295)$  and  $\eta(1475)$  are much like the radially excited isovector pseudoscalar  $q\bar{q}$  and pseudoscalar  $s\bar{s}$  without annihilation. The difference between the isoscalar  $\eta$ ,  $\eta'$  mesons and the isovector pion is that the former have disconnected insertions (annihilation) with the coupling going through the contact term in the topological susceptibility which pushes their masses up. By virtue of the fact that  $\eta(1295)$  is degenerate with  $\pi(1300)$  and  $\eta(1475)$  is  $\sim 200$  MeV above, they do not seem to acquire such an enhancement for their masses. Therefore, we venture to suggest that the annihilation process is not important for these two mesons, and their mixing with the glueball is weak.

A pseudoscalar glueball mass about 1.4 GeV was also determined from the framework of the  $\eta$ - $\eta'$ - $G$  mixing in [40], but with a strategy quite different from ours: The mixing is assumed to occur through a perturbative potential, so that the mixing angles are parametrized in terms of the transition strength among the states  $\eta_q$ ,  $\eta_s$  and  $g$  and their masses  $m_{\eta_q}$ ,  $m_{\eta_s}$  and  $m_g$  [40]. These parameters were then fixed from data fitting. Hence, it is the unmixed glueball mass  $m_g$ , instead of the physical glueball mass  $m_G$ , that was derived in [40]. Moreover, the result of [40] is a consequence of data fitting, while ours comes from the solution to Eq. (21). If the quark flavor states do not mix strongly with the glueball,  $m_G$  is expected to be close to that of  $m_g$ . Following this reasoning, three possible  $0^{-+}$  glueball candidates,  $\eta(1405)$ ,  $\eta(1475)$ , and  $X(1835)$  with masses around 1.4 GeV, have been examined in [40], and the latter two were found to be experimentally disfavored.

#### IV. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

We now proceed to solve Eqs. (14)-(19) based on the large  $N_c$  hierarchy in Eq. (13). As discussed in Sec. II, all the anomaly matrix elements will be kept. Even though they are small parametrically ( $O(1)$  and  $O(1/\sqrt{N_c})$ ), they are large numerically. As a follow up of the last section, we first neglect the decay constants  $f_q^s$ ,  $f_s^q$ , and  $f_g^{q,s}$ , which are  $O(1/\sqrt{N_c})$  and  $O(1/N_c)$  lower than  $f_{q,s}$ , respectively. We also neglect the pseudoscalar density matrix elements  $m_{qg}^2$ ,  $m_{sg}^2$ ,  $m_{qs}^2$ , and  $m_{sq}^2$ , which are similarly suppressed as compared to  $m_{qq}^2$  and  $m_{ss}^2$ <sup>1</sup>. Under this approximation, our formalism involves six unknowns: three mass related terms  $m_G$ ,  $m_{qq}^2$ , and  $m_{ss}^2$ , and three anomaly matrix elements  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle$ ,  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle$ , and  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle$ , provided that the phenomenological quantities  $m_\eta^2$ ,  $m_{\eta'}^2$ ,  $f_q$ ,  $f_s$ ,  $\phi$  and  $\phi_G$  are given as inputs. There are six equations from Eq. (10), so the six unknowns can be solved in principle. We note in passing that the four unknowns  $m_{qq}^2$ ,  $m_{ss}^2$ ,  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle$ , and  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle$  were solved for five given inputs  $m_\eta^2$ ,  $m_{\eta'}^2$ ,  $f_q$ ,  $f_s$ , and  $\phi$  in the  $\eta$ - $\eta'$  mixing case [41].

Using the central values of the parameter sets from [25], [30], and [26] for  $f_q$ ,  $f_s$ ,  $\phi$  and  $\phi_G$  as inputs, we obtain the following solutions

$$\begin{aligned} m_{qq}^2 &= -0.073 \text{ GeV}^2, & \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle &= 0.069 \text{ GeV}^3, \\ m_{ss}^2 &= 0.52 \text{ GeV}^2, & \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle &= 0.035 \text{ GeV}^3, \\ m_G &= 1.41 \text{ GeV}, & \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle &= -0.033 \text{ GeV}^3, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> The off-diagonal mass terms  $m_{sq}^2$  and  $m_{qs}^2$  have been absorbed into the matrix elements  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle$  and  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle$ , respectively in [26].

TABLE I: Solutions for various inputs of  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle = 0.065 \text{ GeV}^3$  (the first row),  $0.050 \text{ GeV}^3$  (the second row), and  $0.035 \text{ GeV}^3$  (the third row) with  $m_{qq}^2 = m_\pi^2$ ,  $m_{ss}^2 = 2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$ ,  $m_{sg}^2 = m_{qg}^2 = m_{qs}^2 = m_{sq}^2 = 0$  and  $\phi = 42.4^\circ$ . The upper (lower) table is for  $\phi_G = 22^\circ$  ( $\phi_G = 12^\circ$ ).

$r$	$R$	$f_s$	$m_G \text{ (GeV)}$	$\langle 0 \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}G\tilde{G} \eta_s\rangle \text{ (GeV}^3\text{)}$	$\langle 0 \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}G\tilde{G} g\rangle \text{ (GeV}^3\text{)}$
0.004	-0.002	$1.25f_\pi$	1.50	0.037	-0.038
0.22	-0.002	$1.25f_\pi$	1.50	0.028	0.036
0.44	-0.002	$1.25f_\pi$	1.50	0.020	0.111
-0.26	-0.003	$1.28f_\pi$	1.44	0.036	-0.108
0.16	-0.003	$1.28f_\pi$	1.44	0.028	0.035
0.58	-0.003	$1.28f_\pi$	1.44	0.019	0.178

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{qq}^2 &= -0.084 \text{ GeV}^2, \quad \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle = 0.067 \text{ GeV}^3, \\
m_{ss}^2 &= 0.50 \text{ GeV}^2, \quad \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle = 0.032 \text{ GeV}^3, \\
m_G &= 1.30 \text{ GeV}, \quad \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle = -0.015 \text{ GeV}^3,
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{qq}^2 &= 0.012 \text{ GeV}^2, \quad \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle = 0.054 \text{ GeV}^3, \\
m_{ss}^2 &= 0.50 \text{ GeV}^2, \quad \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle = 0.030 \text{ GeV}^3, \\
m_G &= 1.56 \text{ GeV}, \quad \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle = 0 \text{ GeV}^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

The above solutions give us an idea of the range of uncertainties in our predictions. It is observed that the solutions for the anomaly matrix elements associated with the  $\eta_q$  and  $\eta_s$  mesons change little in Eqs. (27)-(29). However,  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle$  for the pseudoscalar glueball varies with the inputs of  $\phi_G$  and  $f_s/f_q$  strongly as can be seen from Eqs. (18) and (19). The solutions of  $m_{qq}^2$  in Eqs. (27) and (28) deviate from the naive expectation  $m_{qq}^2 = m_\pi^2$  [26], while that in Eq. (29) is in better agreement with  $m_\pi^2$  due to a smaller  $f_s$ . The solutions of  $m_{ss}^2$ , on the other hand, are stable with respect to the various inputs, and are close to the expected leading  $N_c$  result  $m_{ss}^2 = 2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$ . The values for  $m_G$  have been shown in Eq. (26) already. We should comment that  $m_{qq}^2$  is small because of the cancellation of two large terms as pointed out in [41]. It flips sign easily, depending on the inputs of  $f_s/f_q$  and OZI-rule violating effects, which have been considered before in the two-angle formalism for the  $\eta$ - $\eta'$  mixing [42, 43]. Our opinion is that introducing the OZI-rule suppressed decay constants  $f_q^s$ ,  $f_s^q$  [32] is more transparent than employing the multiple-angle formalism. It has been observed that the tiny corrections from  $f_q^s$  and  $f_s^q$  can turn a negative  $m_{qq}^2$  into a positive value easily due to the smallness of  $m_{qq}^2$  [32].

In the following, we investigate the higher  $O(1/N_c)$  effects from the decay constants  $f_g^{q,s}$ ,  $f_q^s$ , and  $f_s^q$ , i.e., from  $r$  and  $R$  on our solutions. The pseudoscalar density matrix elements  $m_{qq}^2$ ,  $m_{sg}^2$ ,  $m_{qs}^2$ , and  $m_{sq}^2$  are still ignored. We take  $m_{qq}^2 = m_\pi^2$ ,  $m_{ss}^2 = 2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$  and  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle = 0.065$ ,  $0.050$ , and  $0.035 \text{ GeV}^3$  (the typical values from Eqs. (27)-(29)), as the inputs in order to solve for the unknowns  $r$ ,  $R$  and  $f_s$ . The relation  $m_{ss}^2 = 2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$  seems to hold well for the earlier solutions in Eqs. (27)-(29). Thus, it is reasonable to fix it to its leading  $N_c$  value. Taking  $f_q = f_\pi$ ,  $\phi = 42.4^\circ$  and  $\phi_G = 22^\circ$  and  $12^\circ$ , the corresponding solutions are listed in Table I. The results of  $R$ ,  $f_s$ , and  $m_G$  are independent of the inputs of  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle$ , reaffirming that  $m_G$  is independent of  $r$  as seen from Eq. (21). The magnitude of  $R$  is smaller than that of  $r$ , which in turn is smaller than unity. This finding is in agreement with the large  $N_c$  counting rule. The decay constant  $f_s$  turns out to be lower than those in [25, 30], following from the observation that a smaller  $f_s$  leads to a positive  $m_{qq}^2$  [41]. The values of  $m_G$  and  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_s\rangle$  are consistent with the range derived in Eqs. (27)-(29), implying that these higher  $O(1/N_c)$  effects are small. The parameters  $r$  and  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle$  are found to be sensitive to the inputs, and both of them increase with decreasing  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle$ .

Finally, we explore the impact of  $m_{sg}^2$  on our solutions. To do so, we add  $f_s$  as an input so that  $m_{sg}^2$  can be introduced as an unknown.  $m_{qg}^2$  is not considered, because its effect should be very minor as explained before. The results for the various inputs of  $f_s = (1.24-1.30)f_\pi$ ,  $\phi_G = 22^\circ$  and  $12^\circ$ , and  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle = 0.050$  ( $0.035$ )  $\text{GeV}^3$  are listed in Table II (III). In the large  $N_c$  analysis for the resolution of the  $U(1)$  anomaly



TABLE II: Same as Table I except that  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle = 0.050 \text{ GeV}^3$  and  $f_s$  is fixed to trade for  $m_{sg}^2$  as a free parameter.

$f_s$	$r$	$R$	$m_{sg}^2 (\text{GeV}^2)$	$m_G (\text{GeV})$	$\langle 0 \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}G\tilde{G} \eta_s\rangle (\text{GeV}^3)$	$\langle 0 \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}G\tilde{G} g\rangle (\text{GeV}^3)$
$1.24f_\pi$	0.22	-0.001	-0.009	1.60	0.028	0.036
$1.26f_\pi$	0.22	-0.003	0.004	1.47	0.028	0.036
$1.28f_\pi$	0.23	-0.005	0.016	1.34	0.028	0.038
$1.30f_\pi$	0.24	-0.007	0.029	1.21	0.028	0.040
$1.24f_\pi$	0.12	0.001	-0.054	2.15	0.027	0.030
$1.26f_\pi$	0.13	-0.001	-0.029	1.84	0.027	0.031
$1.28f_\pi$	0.15	-0.003	-0.005	1.52	0.027	0.034
$1.30f_\pi$	0.24	-0.005	0.018	1.16	0.028	0.045

TABLE III: Same as Table II except  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle = 0.035 \text{ GeV}^3$ .

$f_s$	$r$	$R$	$m_{sg}^2 (\text{GeV}^2)$	$m_G (\text{GeV})$	$\langle 0 \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}G\tilde{G} \eta_s\rangle (\text{GeV}^3)$	$\langle 0 \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}G\tilde{G} g\rangle (\text{GeV}^3)$
$1.24f_\pi$	0.40	-0.001	-0.009	1.60	0.019	0.105
$1.26f_\pi$	0.45	-0.003	0.004	1.47	0.020	0.113
$1.28f_\pi$	0.54	-0.005	0.016	1.34	0.021	0.126
$1.30f_\pi$	0.69	-0.007	0.029	1.21	0.022	0.148
$1.24f_\pi$	0.27	0.001	-0.054	2.15	0.018	0.136
$1.26f_\pi$	0.34	-0.001	-0.029	1.84	0.018	0.146
$1.28f_\pi$	0.51	-0.003	-0.005	1.52	0.019	0.168
$1.30f_\pi$	1.18	-0.005	0.018	1.16	0.023	0.262

[27, 28, 29], it is the combined contribution from a contact term and the glueball that cancels the  $\eta'$  contribution to give a zero topological susceptibility in full QCD in the chiral limit. This combined contribution is just the topological susceptibility  $\chi_{\text{quench}}$  in the quenched QCD, which leads to the Witten-Veneziano mass formula  $m_{\eta'}^2 = 4N_F \chi_{\text{quench}}/f_\pi^2$ .  $\chi_{\text{quench}}$  is calculated to be  $\approx 0.00133 \text{ GeV}^4$  [24], and the quenched glueball contributes about  $-11\%$  to  $\chi_{\text{quench}}$  [18], which makes the contact term to be  $\approx 0.00148 \text{ GeV}^4$ . It is observed that the anomaly matrix element  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle$  is  $0.105 \text{ GeV}^3$  or larger in Table III. This anomaly matrix element contributes  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle^2/(-4m_g^2) \approx -0.00141 \text{ GeV}^4$  to the topological susceptibility for  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle = 0.105 \text{ GeV}^3$  and  $m_g = 1.4 \text{ GeV}$ . Namely, the glueball contribution is as large as but destructive to the contact term. As the glueball contribution and the contact term already cancel each other to a large extent, there is no room left for the contact term to cancel the sizable  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$  contributions in order to end in a very small topological susceptibility in full QCD, which has a value  $\chi(\text{full QCD}) = -\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle/(1/m_u + 1/m_d + 1/m_s) \sim 4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^4$  [44]. It implies that the anomaly matrix element  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle = 0.105 \text{ GeV}^3$  is probably too large.

Based on the above reasoning, we believe that  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|g\rangle \geq 0.105 \text{ GeV}^3$  is not likely to be a viable solution. This criterion would exclude all the results in Table III with  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta_q\rangle = 0.035 \text{ GeV}^3$  as an input. For Table II, it is seen that  $m_{sg}^2$  and  $m_G$  do depend on  $f_s$  sensitively. In some cases, we have  $m_G$  as large as  $1.84 \text{ GeV}$  and  $2.15 \text{ GeV}$ , for which  $m_{sg}^2$  are negative and large. We cannot discard these solutions of  $m_{sg}^2$  *a priori*, but they are not favored due to their negative values. This issue can be sorted out, when lattice calculations of  $m_{sg}^2$  with dynamical fermions are available. As  $f_s \geq 1.30 f_\pi$ ,  $m_G$  becomes smaller than  $1.2 \text{ GeV}$ , where there are no pseudoscalar glueball candidates. Therefore, if excluding the solutions with large and negative  $m_{sg}^2$ , the range  $(1.4 \pm 0.1) \text{ GeV}$  of the pseudoscalar glueball mass obtained in Sec. III will be more or less respected.

Having studied the higher  $O(1/N_c)$  effects and confirmed that they are small, modulo the uncertainty regarding  $m_{sg}^2$ , we shall simply use the typical results in Eq. (27) [Eq. (28)] to obtain the anomaly matrix elements

for the physical states  $\eta, \eta'$  and  $G$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta\rangle &= 0.026(0.028) \text{ GeV}^3, \\ \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta'\rangle &= 0.054(0.057) \text{ GeV}^3, \\ \langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|G\rangle &= -0.059(-0.041) \text{ GeV}^3.\end{aligned}\quad (30)$$

It is found that the value of  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta\rangle$  is close to  $\sqrt{3/2}f_\eta m_\eta^2/3 \approx 0.021 \text{ GeV}^3$  obtained in [45], and  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta'\rangle$  is within a factor of two from its chiral limit estimated from the topological susceptibility, i.e.,  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta'\rangle = 2\sqrt{N_F}\chi/f_\pi = 0.035 \text{ GeV}^3$ . Equation (30) also reveals that  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|G\rangle$  is almost the same as that from the quenched lattice QCD calculation, which gives  $|\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|G\rangle| = (0.06 \pm 0.01) \text{ GeV}^3$  [18]. The fact that  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta'\rangle$  is comparable to  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|G\rangle$ , which defies the large  $N_c$  scaling in Eq. (13), implies that the  $\eta'$  meson production in the  $J/\psi$  radiative decay may have a branching ratio as large as that for the pseudoscalar glueball production.

Given the mixing angles, we can predict the widths of the  $G \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, \ell^+\ell^-$  decays, assuming that they take place through the quark content [11]. The ratio of the  $G \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  width over the  $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  one is expressed as

$$\frac{\Gamma(G \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)}{\Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)} = \frac{1}{9} \left( \frac{m_G}{m_{\pi^0}} \right)^3 \left( 5 \frac{f_\pi}{f_q} \sin \theta_i \sin \phi_G + \sqrt{2} \frac{f_\pi}{f_s} \cos \theta_i \sin \phi_G \right)^2. \quad (31)$$

We have confirmed that both the parameter sets in [25] and [30] give the  $\eta, \eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  widths in agreement with the data  $\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \approx 0.51 \text{ keV}$  and  $\Gamma(\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \approx 4.28 \text{ keV}$  [38], by considering the similar ratios for the  $\eta, \eta'$  mesons. The parameter set in [25] ([30]) leads to a ratio 387 (83.3) in Eq. (31), i.e., the decay width  $\Gamma(G \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 3(0.6) \text{ keV}$  for  $\Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 7.7 \text{ eV}$  [38]. If  $\eta(1405)$  is a pseudoscalar glueball, we predict the branching ratio  $\mathcal{B}(\eta(1405) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 6(1) \times 10^{-5}$ , i.e., an order of  $10^{-5}$  for the total decay width  $\Gamma(\eta(1405)) = 51 \text{ MeV}$  [38]. The above result can be confronted with future experimental data. The “stickiness”  $S$  has been proposed to be a useful quantity for identifying a glueball rich state [46], which is defined as the ratio of  $\Gamma(J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma G)$  to  $\Gamma(G \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$  with the phase space factors taken out. Combining our predictions for the pseudoscalar glueball production and decay, we obtain  $S = 18\text{-}80$  for  $G$ , which is much larger than  $S = 1$  as defined for the  $\eta$  meson.

For the  $G \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$  decays, we calibrate their widths using the available  $\pi^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$  and  $\eta \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  data:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Gamma(G \rightarrow e^+e^-)}{\Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-)} &= \frac{1}{9} \left( \frac{m_G}{m_{\pi^0}} \right)^3 \left( 5 \frac{f_\pi}{f_q} \sin \theta_i \sin \phi_G + \sqrt{2} \frac{f_\pi}{f_s} \cos \theta_i \sin \phi_G \right)^2, \\ \frac{\Gamma(G \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)}{\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)} &= \left( \frac{m_G}{m_\eta} \right)^3 \left( 5 \frac{f_\pi}{f_q} \sin \theta_i \sin \phi_G + \sqrt{2} \frac{f_\pi}{f_s} \cos \theta_i \sin \phi_G \right)^2 \\ &\quad \times \left[ 5 \frac{f_\pi}{f_q} (\cos \phi + \sin \theta \sin \theta_i \Delta_G) - \sqrt{2} \frac{f_\pi}{f_s} (\sin \phi + \sin \theta \cos \theta_i \Delta_G) \right]^{-2}.\end{aligned}\quad (32)$$

For  $\Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-) = 4.8 \times 10^{-7} \text{ eV}$  [38], we obtain  $\Gamma(G \rightarrow e^+e^-) = 1.9(0.4) \times 10^{-4} \text{ eV}$  using the parameter set from [25] ([30]). For  $\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = 7.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}$  [38], we have  $\Gamma(G \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = 4.0(1.0) \times 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$ . If  $\eta(1405)$  is a pseudoscalar glueball, the above predictions correspond to the branching ratios  $\mathcal{B}(\eta(1405) \rightarrow e^+e^-) = 4(0.8) \times 10^{-12}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\eta(1405) \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = 8(2) \times 10^{-10}$ , which would be quite a challenge to observe experimentally.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have formulated the  $\eta\text{-}\eta'\text{-}G$  mixing scheme via the vacuum to meson transition matrix elements for the anomalous Ward identity. The extension to include the glueball mixing with the flavor-singlet  $\eta_1$  is a generalization of the FKS scheme for the  $\eta\text{-}\eta'$  mixing [26]. Therefore, only one extra angle  $\phi_G$  for the mixing of the glueball state  $g$  and  $\eta_1$  is introduced in addition to the angle  $\phi$  in the FKS scheme. We have explained the different parameter extractions from the same set of  $\eta, \eta'$  meson data in [25] and [30], which give an idea of the uncertainties contained in the inputs. The obtained pseudoscalar glueball mass  $m_G$  around 1.4

GeV is much lower than the results from quenched lattice QCD ( $> 2.0$  GeV). It has been examined that our solution for  $m_G$  depends weakly on the ratio of the decay constants  $f_s/f_q$  in the favored phenomenological range and is stable against the variation of  $\phi_G$  and the higher  $O(1/N_c)$  corrections.

There may not exist a unique feature which tells a glueball apart from a quark-antiquark state. We need to combine information from  $J/\psi$  radiative decays, hadronic decays, as well as  $\gamma\gamma$  and leptonic decays as advocated in [47]. The comparison of our solutions with the available data suggests that  $\eta(1405)$ , which is copiously produced in the  $J/\psi$  radiative decay but has not been seen in the  $\gamma\gamma$  reaction, is a strong pseudoscalar glueball candidate. The anomaly matrix elements  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|\eta'\rangle$  and  $\langle 0|\alpha_s G\tilde{G}/(4\pi)|G\rangle$  in Eq. (30) are in reasonable agreement with those estimated from the topological susceptibility and quenched lattice calculation. According to our analysis, the  $\eta(1405) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  decay width is 0.6-3 keV, and the leptonic decays  $\eta(1405) \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$  are very small. Both predictions can be confronted with future experiments.

This work was supported by the National Science Council of R.O.C. under the Grant Nos. NSC-95-2112-M-050-MY3, NSC96-2112-M-001-003 and by the National Center for Theoretical Sciences of R.O.C. It is also partially supported by U.S. DOE grant no. DE-FG05-84ER40154. HYC and HNL acknowledge the hospitality of R. Fleischer during their visit to the CERN Theory Institute in June 2008, and of Y.L. Wu during their visit to the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, China, where part of this work was done. KFL would like to acknowledge the hospitality of Academia Sinica during his visit when this work was initiated.

- 
- [1] R. Armenteros et al., Proceedings of the Sienna International Conference on Elementary Particles (Societa Italiana di Fisica, Bologna, Italy, 1963) 1, 287 (1963); P. Baillon et al., Nuovo Cimento **50A**, 393 (1967).
  - [2] Mark II Collaboration, D. L. Scharre et al., Phys. Lett. B **97**, 329 (1980).
  - [3] Crystal Ball Collaboration, C. Edwards et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 259 (1982); *ibid* **50**, (E)219 (1983).
  - [4] J.F. Donoghue, K. Johnson, and B.A. Li, Phys. Lett. B **99**, 416 (1981).
  - [5] M.S. Chanowitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 981 (1981).
  - [6] K. Ishikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 978 (1981).
  - [7] R. Lacaze and H. Navelet, Nucl. Phys. B **186**, 247 (1981).
  - [8] C.E. Carlson, J.J. Coyne, P.M. Fishbane, F. Gross, and S. Meshkov, Phys. Lett. B **98**, 110 (1981).
  - [9] A. Masoni, C. Cicalo, and G.L. Usai, J. Phys. G **32**, R293 (2006).
  - [10] L3 Collaboration, M. Acciarri et al., Phys. Lett. B **501**, 1 (2001).
  - [11] D.M. Li, H. Yu, and S.S. Fang, Eur. Phys. J. C **28**, 335 (2003).
  - [12] L. Faddeev, A.J. Niemi, and U. Wiedner, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 114033 (2004).
  - [13] S.B. Gerasimov, M. Majewski, and V. A. Meshcheryakov, arXiv:0708.3762 [hep-ph].
  - [14] N. Wu, T.N. Ruan, and Z.P. Zheng, Chin. Phys. **10**, 611 (2001) [hep-ph/0011338].
  - [15] N. Kochelev and D.P. Min, Phys. Lett. B **633**, 283 (2006); B.A. Li, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 034019 (2006); X.G. He, X.Q. Li, X. Liu and J.P. Ma, Eur. Phys. J. C **49**, 731 (2007).
  - [16] H.Y. Cheng, C.K. Chua, and K.F. Liu, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 094005 (2006).
  - [17] N. Mathur, A. Alexandru, Y. Chen, S.J. Dong, T. Draper, Horváth, F.X. Lee, K.F. Liu, S. Tamhankar, and J.B. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 114505 (2007).
  - [18] Y. Chen et al., Phys. Rev. D **73**, 014516 (2006).
  - [19] UKQCD Collaboration, G.S. Bali et al., Phys. Lett. B **309**, 378 (1993).
  - [20] C.J. Morningstar and M. Peardon, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 034509 (1999).
  - [21] S. Narison, Nucl. Phys. **B509**, 312 (1998); H. Forkel, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 054008 (2005); X.G. He, W.S. Hou, and C.S. Huang, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 99 (1998).
  - [22] G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 055003 (1998).
  - [23] V. Mathieu, N. Kochelev, and V. Vento, arXiv:0810.4453 [hep-ph].
  - [24] L.D. Debbio, L. Giusti, and C. Pica, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 032003 (2005); S. Durr, Z. Fodor, C. Hoelbling, and T. Kurth, JHEP **0704**, 055 (2007).
  - [25] KLOE Collaboration, F. Ambrosino et al., Phys. Lett. B **648**, 267 (2007).
  - [26] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll, and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 114006 (1998); Phys. Lett. B **449**, 339 (1999).
  - [27] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B156**, 269 (1979).
  - [28] G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. **B159**, 213 (1979).
  - [29] K. Kawarabayashi and N. Ohta, Nucl. Phys. **B175**, 477 (1980); Prog. Theor. Phys. **66**, 1789 (1981); N. Ohta, Prog. Theor. Phys. **66**, 1408 (1981).

- [30] R. Escribano and J. Nadal, JHEP **0705**, 006 (2007).
- [31] S. Okubo, Phys. Lett. **5**, 165 (1963); G. Zweig, CERN Report TH-401 (1964); I Iizuka, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **37**, 21 (1966).
- [32] J.F. Hsu, Y.Y. Charng, and H-n. Li, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 014020 (2008).
- [33] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B72**, 461 (1974).
- [34] T. Feldmann, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15**, 159 (2000).
- [35] A. Bramon, R. Escribano, and M.D. Scadron, Phys. Lett. B **503**, 271 (2001).
- [36] C.E. Carlson and T.H. Hansson, Nucl. Phys. **B199**, 441 (1982).
- [37] R. Escribano, arXiv:0807.4201 [hep-ph].
- [38] Particle Data Group, C. Amsler et al., Phys. Lett. B **667**, 1 (2008).
- [39] T. Gutsche, V.E. Lyubovitskij, and M.C. Tichy, arXiv:0811.0668 [hep-ph].
- [40] G. Li, Q. Zhao, and C.H. Chang, J. Phys. G **35**, 055002 (2008).
- [41] Y.Y. Charng, T. Kurimoto, and H-n. Li, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 074024 (2006).
- [42] J. Schechter, A. Subbaraman, and H. Weigel, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 339 (1993).
- [43] H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **64**, 223 (1998); R. Kaiser and H. Leutwyler, in Proc. Workshop "Nonperturbative Methods in Quantum Field Theory", NITP/CSSM, University of Adelaide, Australia, Feb. 1998, eds. A.W. Schreiber, A.G. Williams and A.W. Thomas (World Scientific, Singapore 1998) [hep-ph/9806336].
- [44] H. Leutwyler and A. Smilga, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 5607 (1992).
- [45] V.A. Novikov, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein, and V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B165**, 55 (1980); H.B. Meyer, arXiv:0808.3151 [hep-lat].
- [46] M. Chanowitz, in Proceeding of the VI International Workshop on Photon-Photon Collisions, 1984, edited by R. Lander (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985), pp4.
- [47] K.F. Liu, B.A. Li, and K. Ishikawa, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 3648 (1989).